

Investigation into the Wholesale Billing Practices of  
Wisconsin Bell, Inc. d/b/a SBC Wisconsin

6720-TI-183

### **I. Purpose**

*This form is designed to have carriers identify and document issues in advance of the July 30, 2003 prehearing conference. It will also be used to track issues as issues are discussed during subsequent prehearing conferences. Carriers are not precluded from raising additional issues at or even after the July 30, 2003 prehearing conference, but Carriers will be expected to complete this form as issues are subsequently raised. Notwithstanding, all carriers are encouraged to submit as many of their issues as possible prior to the July 30, 2003 prehearing conference. A date will be established at a subsequent prehearing conference after which no new issues will be permitted.*

### **II. Directions**

1. Please complete a separate form for each issue.
2. Time permitting and to the extent possible, carriers with similar issues are encouraged to make a joint submission.
3. Please do not include any confidential and/or CPNI information. How to handle confidential and/or CPNI information will be discussed at the July 30, 2003 prehearing conference.
4. Please return to Nick Linden by e-mail ([nicholas.linden@psc.state.wi.us](mailto:nicholas.linden@psc.state.wi.us)) no later than the close of business (COB) Friday, July 25, 2003.

### **III. Submitting Carrier(s) General Information**

Submitted by: SBC

Contact: **Richelle Barker**  
Telephone Number: (414)-227-6915  
e-mail: [rb8434@sbc.com](mailto:rb8434@sbc.com)

Subject Matter Expert (SME): **Brian Van Hoof**  
Telephone Number: (414)-227-6981  
e-mail: [bv3165@sbc.com](mailto:bv3165@sbc.com)

Authorized Representative: **Brian Van Hoof**  
Telephone Number: (414)-227-6981  
e-mail: [bv3165@sbc.com](mailto:bv3165@sbc.com)

### **IV. Issue Identification**

Name: **Rate Disputes**  
Brief Description: **CLECs have billed SBC incorrect rates for both local and intraLata toll usage. The outstanding dispute amounts for local rate disputes is approximately \$.3M and \$.7M for intraLata toll rate disputes. CLECs that have billed incorrect rates include:**  
**Northern Telephone & Data**  
**Net Lec**  
**TCG**

Time Warner  
KMC  
McLeod/Ovation  
TDS  
Choice One  
CTC Communications

#### V. Analysis of Issue

Please answer the following questions:

1. When this issue was first discovered? **7/1998**
2. How many occurrences and approximately over how long a period of time? **Monthly occurrence since 1998**
3. Is it a recurring problem? **Yes**
4. Your belief as to the cause of the problem. **Inaccurate CLEC interpretation/application of the interconnection agreement or tariff.**
5. Does this issue involve an interpretation and/or application of law, contract or tariff? If so, please explain.
6. What priority would you give this issue? In other words, how would you rank this issue in terms of importance and urgency: High, Medium or Low? **Low Priority**
7. Any other pertinent information?

#### VI. Prior Attempts to Resolve the Issue (*Please do not re-argue your case here or submit supporting documents.*)

Please answer the following questions:

1. Was this issue raised with the opposing carrier? If so, when and how? **Each month that SBC receives an invoice with inappropriate charges, in accordance with the Interconnection Agreement, SBC notifies the CLEC of the dispute by sending a letter notifying the CLEC of the dispute type and the amount of the dispute.**
2. Was this issue escalated for dispute resolution? If so, when and in what forum? **In some cases, SBC has invoked informal and or formal dispute resolution with the CLEC in an attempt to resolve. The notification of escalation would have been done in accordance with the ICA and would have been via letter or email.**
3. Last known position of the opposing carrier. **Unknown in many cases.**
4. Were any bill adjustments made to resolve this issue? **Only minor if any credits received at all.**
5. Were any policies or procedures changed to address this issue? If so, what changes were made?

#### VII. Relief Sought

*(Described relief desired or needed including, but not limited to, proposed changes to Performance Measurements (PMs).)* **SBC seeks credits from the CLECs that have billed SBC at incorrect local and intralata toll rates on an historic basis. Additionally, SBC seeks to have the CLECs correct the incorrect rates to avoid such disputes on prospective bills from the CLECs. Finally, SBC seeks to have carriers charge SBC an intralata toll rate that is no higher than the SBC access rate, unless a CLEC cost study proves a higher rate.**

#### VIII. Opposing Carrier's Response (*to be completed after July 30, 2003, prehearing*)

*(Briefly respond to submitting carrier(s) by either agreeing or disagreeing with statements made above, and by answering the following questions.)*

**A. Analysis of Issue**

1. Your belief as to the cause of the problem. ***TDS Metrocom has never believed that we were billing an incorrect rate. However, in the interest of resolving this issue, both companies agreed upon a rate structure that was acceptable to both parties. This issue has been resolved, to what we understand, both SBC and TDS Metrocoms satisfaction.***
2. Does this issue involve an interpretation and/or application of law, contract or tariff? If so, please explain. ***See response to A(1) above.***
3. What performance measures can be implemented to monitor the desired system operation? ***N/A***
4. Any other pertinent information? ***See response to A(1) above.***

**B. Prior Attempts to Resolve the Issue**

1. Last known position of the submitting carrier. ***See response to A(1) above.***
2. Were any bill adjustments made to resolve this issue? ***See response to A(1) above.***
3. How were the adjustments communicated to the submitting carrier? Please attach any relevant accessible letter(s). ***See response to A(1) above.***
4. Identify any other carrier(s) known to have experienced similar problems. ***TDS Metrocom is not aware of any.***
5. Did you identify any other problems arising from or related to this issue? ***No.***
6. What steps, if any, did you take to proactively identify other billing issues arising from or related to this issue? Please attach any relevant accessible letter(s). ***TDS Metrocom and SBC worked jointly together to resolve the root cause of this issue.***
7. Were any policies or procedures changed to address this issue? If so, what changes were made? ***See response to A(1) above.***

**IX. Opposing Carrier's General Information** *(to be completed after July 30, 2003, prehearing)*

Submitted by: ***TDS Metrocom***

Contact ***Rod Cox***

Telephone Number: ***608-663-3029***

e-mail: ***rod.cox@tdsmetro.com***

Subject Matter Expert (SME): ***Rod Cox***

Telephone Number: ***608-663-3029***

e-mail: ***rod.cox@tdsmetro.com***

Authorized Representative: ***Rod Cox***

TDS Response to SBC Rate Issues

Telephone Number: **608-663-3029**  
e-mail: **rod.cox@tdsmetro.com**

**X. Further Investigative Activities** *(for staff use only)*

**XI. Final Disposition** *(for staff use only)*

T:\dockets\ti\SBC wholesale billing docket template.doc

Investigation into the Wholesale Billing Practices of  
Wisconsin Bell, Inc. d/b/a SBC Wisconsin

6720-TI-183

### **I. Purpose**

*This form is designed to have carriers identify and document issues in advance of the July 30, 2003 prehearing conference. It will also be used to track issues as issues are discussed during subsequent prehearing conferences. Carriers are not precluded from raising additional issues at or even after the July 30, 2003 prehearing conference, but Carriers will be expected to complete this form as issues are subsequently raised. Notwithstanding, all carriers are encouraged to submit as many of their issues as possible prior to the July 30, 2003 prehearing conference. A date will be established at a subsequent prehearing conference after which no new issues will be permitted.*

### **II. Directions**

1. Please complete a separate form for each issue.
2. Time permitting and to the extent possible, carriers with similar issues are encouraged to make a joint submission.
3. Please do not include any confidential and/or CPNI information. How to handle confidential and/or CPNI information will be discussed at the July 30, 2003 prehearing conference.
4. Please return to Nick Linden by e-mail ([nicholas.linden@psc.state.wi.us](mailto:nicholas.linden@psc.state.wi.us)) no later than the close of business (COB) Friday, July 25, 2003.

### **III. Submitting Carrier(s) General Information**

Submitted by: SBC

Contact: **Richelle Barker**

Telephone Number: (414)-227-6915

e-mail: [rb8434@sbc.com](mailto:rb8434@sbc.com)

Subject Matter Expert (SME): **Brian Van Hoof**

Telephone Number: (414)-227-6981

e-mail: [bv3165@sbc.com](mailto:bv3165@sbc.com)

Authorized Representative: **Brian Van Hoof**

Telephone Number: (414)-227-6981

e-mail: [bv3165@sbc.com](mailto:bv3165@sbc.com)

### **IV. Issue Identification**

Name: **Minute of Use Disputes**

Brief Description: **CLECs have billed SBC for local and intralata toll minutes of use that did not originate from SBC end users. The total outstanding dispute is approximately \$12M. CLECs involved are:**

**Northern Telephone and Data**

**Net LEC**

**ATT**

**TCG**

MCI  
Time Warner  
KMC Telecom  
McLeod/Ovation  
TDS Metrocom  
Choice One  
CTC Communications  
Sprint

#### V. Analysis of Issue

Please answer the following questions:

1. When this issue was first discovered? **11/1998**
2. How many occurrences and approximately over how long a period of time?  
**Monthly occurrence since 1998**
3. Is it a recurring problem? **Yes**
4. Your belief as to the cause of the problem. **Faulty CLEC billing system/logic that may not be removing UNE traffic, ported traffic or traffic originated by third parties from the minutes of use CLEC bills to SBC. Additionally, there is the potential that the CLEC billing systems could be using faulty logic in the creation of usage bills to SBC, such as billing SBC for connect time versus conversation time.**
5. Does this issue involve an interpretation and/or application of law, contract or tariff? If so, please explain. **This does not appear to be a contract or tariff issue to SBC. It appears to be more of a process issue with CLEC billing systems and processes.**
6. What priority would you give this issue? In other words, how would you rank this issue in terms of importance and urgency: High, Medium or Low? **High**
7. Any other pertinent information?

#### VI. Prior Attempts to Resolve the Issue (Please do not re-argue your case here or submit supporting documents.)

Please answer the following questions:

1. Was this issue raised with the opposing carrier? If so, when and how? **Each month that SBC receives an invoice with inappropriate charges, in accordance with the Interconnection Agreement, SBC notifies the CLEC of the dispute by sending a letter notifying the CLEC of the dispute type and the amount of the dispute. In some cases, SBC has gone so far as to provide a month worth of call detail to CLECs to justify the amounts SBC has paid and disputed. In most of these cases where data has been exchanged, SBC has also helped the CLEC identify flaws in CLEC billing system logic as well as helped identify other carriers that are sending traffic to CLEC.**
2. Was this issue escalated for dispute resolution? If so, when and in what forum? **In many cases, the dispute has been escalated per the dispute resolution section of the ICA.**
3. Last known position of the opposing carrier. **In many cases, CLECs assert that since the traffic came over the SBC trunk groups, SBC has responsibility for compensating CLEC for such traffic, even though transit traffic may come over the same trunk groups.**

4. Were any bill adjustments made to resolve this issue? *In some cases, adjustments have been made, but only after extensive analysis of CLEC billing systems and data exchanges.*
5. Were any policies or procedures changed to address this issue? If so, what changes were made?

#### **VII. Relief Sought**

*(Described relief desired or needed including, but not limited to, proposed changes to Performance Measurements (PMs).) SBC seeks to have CLECs credit SBC for minutes of use that SBC has disputed because those minutes did not originate from SBC end users. SBC also requests that CLEC refrain from billing SBC for these minutes of use on all future invoices.*

#### **VIII. Opposing Carrier's Response (to be completed after July 30, 2003, prehearing)**

*(Briefly respond to submitting carrier(s) by either agreeing or disagreeing with statements made above, and by answering the following questions.)*

##### **A. Analysis of Issue**

1. Your belief as to the cause of the problem. *Metrocom believes that the cause of this problem is due to SBC failing to provide us with appropriate information to identify the true originating carrier. Absent this information, which only SBC has access to, TDS Metrocom has to assume that the traffic was originated by SBC, thus they should be billed.*
2. Does this issue involve an interpretation and/or application of law, contract or tariff? If so, please explain. *TDS Metrocom does not believe it is.*
3. What performance measures can be implemented to monitor the desired system operation? *N/A.*
4. Any other pertinent information? *TDS Metrocom has the exact same type of dispute with SBC (TDS disputing traffic that SBC is charging us for).*

##### **B. Prior Attempts to Resolve the Issue**

1. Last known position of the submitting carrier. *Although SBC has made an improvement to their process, which was to start providing TDS Metrocom a report showing minutes of usage originated by UNE-P carriers, they have yet to make the necessary modifications to their systems to provide us with the originating carrier identification for all traffic to prove what traffic was not originated by SBC.*
2. Were any bill adjustments made to resolve this issue? *Yes. Some.*
3. How were the adjustments communicated to the submitting carrier? Please attach any relevant accessible letter(s). *Phone conversations between representatives of TDS Metrocom and SBC.*
4. Identify any other carrier(s) known to have experienced similar problems. *TDS Metrocom is not aware of any other carriers experiencing the same problem.*
5. Did you identify any other problems arising from or related to this issue? *TDS Metrocom continues to research this issue and hopes to have more to share in the future of this proceeding.*

TDS Response to SBC MOU Issue

6. What steps, if any, did you take to proactively identify other billing issues arising from or related to this issue? Please attach any relevant accessible letter(s). ***TDS Metrocom has participated in ongoing discussions with SBC to identify what corrections need to be made to both companies OSS to resolve this issue.***
7. Were any policies or procedures changed to address this issue? If so, what changes were made? ***Yes. TDS Metrocom has made some modifications to their Billing OSS to address the gaps in our process, however, we continue to struggle to get SBC to make the needed modifications to their OSS to close their gaps.***

**IX. Opposing Carrier's General Information** *(to be completed after July 30, 2003, prehearing)*

Submitted by: ***TDS Metrocom***

Contact ***Rod Cox***

Telephone Number: ***608-663-3029***

e-mail: ***rod.cox@tdsmetro.com***

Subject Matter Expert (SME): ***Rod Cox***

Telephone Number: ***608-663-3029***

e-mail: ***rod.cox@tdsmetro.com***

Authorized Representative: ***Rod Cox***

Telephone Number: ***608-663-3029***

e-mail: ***rod.cox@tdsmetro.com***

**X. Further Investigative Activities** *(for staff use only)*

**XI. Final Disposition** *(for staff use only)*